DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 371 JC 860 560

TITLE Community College Fees and Financial Aid.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 38p.; Discussed as Agenda Item 4 at a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, December 4-5, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Fees; Policy Formation; State Legislation; *Statewide Planning; *Student Financial Aid; *Tuition; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In 1984, the California State Legislature enacted a mandatory enrollment fee and a new student financial aid program for California community college students and required the Chancellor of the community colleges to study the fee's impact. This report discusses policy options for fees and financial aid and presents preliminary recommendations for the consideration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (BGCCC). First, background information is provided on the legislative history of student fees in California's community colleges and the prior policies of the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the BGCCC are stated. Next, the two bills constituting current legislative policy with respect to student fees are discussed. After listing the policies recommended by the Master Plan Review Committee, efficiency and equity criteria for determining who should pay for the financing of community colleges are discussed. Next, several principles on which the BGCCC may base specific policy recommendations are suggested, and basic policy options available for consideration are examined. These options are: (1) change termination date of current policies; (2) allow the current policies to terminate as scheduled; (3) continue the current policies; or (4) revise current policies by restructuring the enrollment fee and/or the financial aid program and/or establishing a long-term set of policies. Appendices include information on types of fees charged, an analysis of permissive fees, and revenue estimates for alternative enrollment fee structures. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED275371

IC 860 560

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
December 4-5, 1986

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FEES AND FINANCIAL AID

4

For information

Summary

In AB 1XX (1984), the Legislature enacted a mandatory enrollment fee and a new student financial aid program for California community college students and required the Chancellor of the community colleges to study the fee's impact. A progress report on the study is to be submitted to the Legislature by January 1, 1987, and a final report is due by July 1, 1987. The fee and financial aid are authorized until January 1, 1988.

A preliminary draft of the progress report was reviewed with the Board of Governors at its October 1986 meeting. At that time, it was observed that future discussions on the topic and the sunset date for current policy suggest that the Board and Chancellor would want to develop and submit recommendations prior to the time the final report on the fee's impact is due in July 1987.

This item continues discussion of policy options for fees and financial aid and presents preliminary recommendations for Board of Governors consideration.

The progress report indicates that while the impact of the mandatory enrollment fee was perceptible and about what was expected in 1984-85 (the first year), this impact did not increase in the second year. And, there is preliminary evidence that college enrollments are increasing in the third year and that the fee may have relatively little continuing added impact. The delivery of financial aid also appears to be improving.

After reviewing the experience with existing policies and various recent proposals, it is proposed that the Board use the following principles for development of specific fee and financial aid policies in California community colleges:

1. Community college fees should be low, reflecting an overall policy that the state bears the primary responsibility for the cost of community college education.

2. Community college fees should be predictable, changed in modest fashion in relation to the cost of education, and their burden should be equitably distributed among students.

3. Financial aid should be sufficient to offset fees that may pose a barrier to the access of low income students.

4. Fee and financial aid policies should be consistent with fiscal and academic policies in supporting the dual objectives of access and excellence.

Assessing the implications of these principles in light of current and expected future conditions, staff has developed the following fee and financial aid proposals. The Chancellor recommends that, after the Board's review and further consultation, the item be brought back to the Board for action in January.

Staff work to date indicates that:

(a) The sunset date for AB 1XX should be extended from January 1, 1988, to July 1, 1994.

(b) The structure of the enrollment fee should be changed so that students pay $5 per unit per semester (or a quarter system equivalent) up to a maximum of $50 per semester.

(c) The enrollment fee should be adjusted in fall 1988 and in fall 1991 to reflect the prior three-year change in the cost of community college education. (This would increase the fee to about $6 per unit up to a maximum of $60 per semester in fall 1988.)

(d) All existing fees in AB 1XX should be retained. The health services fee should be reinstated and the course drop fee should be eliminated.

(e) Adequate financial aid should be provided through the Board's Financial Assistance Program and by increasing community college financial aid office staffing.

(f) Work should continue on identifying and obtaining needed additional aid for certain community college students whose financial need and work limit their academic progress.

Recommendations for Board adoption will be presented at the Board of Governors' January 1987 meeting.

Staff Presentation: *Joshua L. Smith*
Chancellor

Background

The Organic Statutes, creating the University of California in 1869, established the principle that California residents should not pay tuition, interpreted in recent years as charges to students for the cost of their instruction. In 1960, the Master Plan Survey Team reaffirmed this principle for all three segments of California public higher education, including community colleges, but added that students should assume greater responsibility for their education by paying fees for services incidental, but not directly related, to instruction. These services were distinguished between (a) "ancillary," such as housing, food, and parking -- to be supported by their users --and (b) "program related," such as health, athletics, and activities -- to be supported by all students.

Over the next two decades, the California community colleges were authorized by the Legislature to charge students a number of fees which were "permissive"; that is, could be charged at the discretion of each district. Besides nonresident tuition and fees for instruction in community services and certain adult education classes, the list of authorized fees for various services had grown to nearly 20 in number by 1983 (see Appendix A). These fees included charges for health, parking, field trips, instructional materials and student records, among others. The colleges collected an estimated $56 million in revenues from these noninstructional fees during the fiscal year 1983-84, an average of $39 per enrolled student. The average fee charged to students varied substantially between districts, however, from a low of less than one dollar to a high of more than $70 annually per student.

Prior Policy

California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1982

Responding to a Legislative request, ACR 81 in 1982, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), proposed a series of guidelines for fees and financial aid in postsecondary education. These guidelines were based on a premise of scarce state funding and limited federal financial aid and suggested that:

1) state and student shares of the cost of education should be explicit;

2) the state should bear the primary responsibility for funding, student fees remaining as low as possible;

3) financial aid should be available to eligible students with demonstrated need;

4) policies should enable students to choose the institution appropriate to their ability and goals;

5) there should be equitable and consistent policies to set and adjust student charges; and

6) state subsidies for community colleges should be restricted to those courses that offer clear public benefits.

CPEC recommended that for the University (UC) and State University (CSU), student fees be set at a proportion of the recent three-year average of state General Fund appropriations for these segments. Ranges of 40-50% for UC and 10-20% for CSU were recommended. The lower levels of these ranges approximated the 1982-83 experience. The report noted that at the 50% level, UC students would support "...instruction -- tuition -- for the first time." The recommended range for CSU was subsequently adopted in a statement of legislative intent (Chapter 1014, 1983).

While CPEC recommended no change in the use of fee revenues, it did express concern that existing practices gave protected status to student services and, at UC, resulted in some students paying for the education of other students.

For the community colleges, CPEC recommended continuing no charge policies for those courses and programs with the highest state priority. In addition, the Board of Governors was to determine the courses taught for avocational, recreational, and personal enrichment purposes that should be self-supported through fees. This recommendation was supported by the Legislature and $30 million of state support for such courses was withdrawn in 1982-83.

Board of Governors, 1982

Another CPEC recommendation in its response to ACR 81 (1982) requested the Board of Governors to prepare a contingency fee plan with procedures to institute mandatory student charges and to distribute related student financial aid. After extensive study and public hearings, the Board responded in December 1982 with a plan that addressed the question of fees and access from two perspectives.

First, the Board declared its opposition to across-the-board tuition and fees, but added that if financial resources were not sufficient to assure access to all community college programs for all citizens, priorities guarantee access to students enrolled in programs leading to a degree or certificate or to students who had not already taken a certain number of college level units.

The second perspective adopted by the Board set forth certain short-term conditions designed to minimize the negative impact of any fee proposal on access, recommending that the fee be: as low as possible, limited to 1983-84 on an "emergency" basis, mandatory for all students in all districts, accompanied by financial aid and support for fee collection costs, and accompanied also by reform of existing permissive fees. In addition, the Board urged that the fee supplement, not

supplant, tax revenues and that there be limits on revenue losses for districts with large numbers of low income students where there likely would be large enrollment losses.

Current Law

Besides the 1983 expression of legislative intent on CSU student fees and the shift in support for certain community college courses, two other major bills constitute current legislative policy in this area: AB 1XX (1984) and SB 195 (1985).

AB 1XX (1984)

In AB 1XX (1984), the Legislature enacted a mandatory enrollment fee and a new student financial aid program for California community college students and required the Chancellor of the community colleges to study the fee's impact. This study was to focus on seven questions and be conducted in consultation with the California Postsecondary Education Commission and with the assistance of an advisory committee.

A progress report on the study is to be submitted to the Legislature by January 1, 1987, and a final report is due by July 1, 1987. The fee and financial aid are authorized until January 1, 1988.

The new enrollment fee, implemented beginning fall 1984, was set at $50 per semester for those taking six or more credit units and $5 per unit for those taking less than six units. Students taking noncredit courses do not pay the fee. As the new fee was implemented, ten formerly-permissive student fees for instructional materials, health, and other student services were eliminated (see Appendix A). Since the use of permissive fees had varied substantially among districts prior to 1984, the net change in cost facing students from the new fee policy also varied substantially from district to district. One district actually reduced its charges per student, the average fee increase for the year was $43, and the largest increase was $71 per student.

Two percent of the fee revenue collected was to be retained by the districts for use in collecting the fee. The balance of fee revenue ($64 million in 1984-85) was to be applied each year as a direct offset to the State General Fund apportionment for the districts, most of which is used for instructional services.

Along with the fee changes, AB 1XX (1984) mandated the Board of Governors to offset the fee for low income students and authorized up to $15 million from General funds for that purpose. In response, the Board established a financial assistance program (BFAP). Regulations were adopted for three kinds of student aid: fee credits for those taking less than six units, fee waivers for those on public assistance,

and grants for others in financial need. BFAP funds were allocated to districts for distribution based on measures of student financial need.

A summary of the preliminary draft of the progress report on findings about the fee's impact was discussed with the Board of Governors at its October 1986 meeting. The progress report draft is being modified and will be transmitted in final form to the Legislature by January 1, 1987.

SB 195 (1985)

In 1984, CPEC responded to a legislative request that it convene a committee to "...develop recommendations on a long-term student fee policy and specific fee level calculation methodologies" for the University of California and California State University. Results of this work were transmitted to the Legislature in December 1984 and enacted in SB 195 (1985) largely as the committee had proposed.

This law expresses legislative intent about fees in the two four-year public segments and includes the following concepts:

1) the state should bear the primary responsibility for the cost of postsecondary education so as to keep student fees as low as possible;

2) students should be responsible for a portion of the cost;

3) necessary fee changes should be gradual, moderate, predictable, and equitably borne by students in each segments -- but, in no case, change by more than 10% in any one year;

4) fee changes should be based on the three-year average of changes in state support per FTE student;

5) fees should be set after consultation with student representatives;

6) fees should be announced at least 10 months prior to their effective date;

7) the state should provide financial aid to offset additional fees; and

8) fee revenues should not be used to support the costs of instruction.

This law specifically excludes the community colleges and will expire August 31, 1990.

Proposed Policy

The Master Plan Review Commission has not yet taken final action on fee and financial aid policies for postsecondary education, but did reach tentative decisions on policy recommendations at its October 1986 meeting. Presumably, these recommendations will return to the Commission in the spring 1987 for final endorsement.

Among the Commission's recommended policies are the following:

1) the state should hold to its current policy where it bears the primary responsibility for the costs of postsecondary education and where students are expected to meet a portion of the cost;

2) segmental governing boards should be authorized to differentiate student fees by student level, resident status, and program;

3) fees should not discourage fully matriculated part-time students from enrolling in additional courses;

4) fees should be waived or offset by financial aid for low income students;

5) state funding should be increased for grants to reverse the shift to loans and for support of on- and off-campus employment; and

6) there should be a statutory guarantee that all eligible students who are in financial need will be provided the financial aid necessary for them to enroll.

Policy Criteria

Criteria for determining who should pay for the financing of community colleges generally rest on two factors: (a) efficiency and (b) equity.

Efficiency criteria concern the allocation of society's resources among different uses. Resources would be allocated efficiently to community college education when the benefits of that education exceed by as much as possible the costs of that education. This condition could be accomplished by the private market (and students pay for the full cost of their education) if the results of community college education were confined solely to those students undergoing that education, if resources were mobile, and if the potential students had perfect information about the benefits that result from their college-going.

None of these theoretical conditions exist. Therefore, a public subsidy of the cost of education is provided in the belief that, otherwise, too few individuals would attend college and too little education would take place. This is because potential students

(a) don't have information on the full benefits they are likely to obtain from a college education, (b) would not consider the substantial benefits that accrue to others in society because of their (the students') education, and (c) have difficulty getting financing. Fewer funds are available to finance education than are available to finance physical capital, largely because there is no "tangible" asset the lender may repossess in the case of default by a student borrower. The public subsidy in this case takes the form of a loan guarantee or interest rate subsidy.

The efficiency criteria do not recognize an individual's ability to pay for education. The equity criterion, by contrast, does and is based on the desire to provide economic and social opportunities to all individuals in society. One way to accomplish this is through the provision of postsecondary education. The public subsidy of the cost of community college education, therefore, also exists to provide equal opportunities for all Californians, regardless of their ability to pay for that education.

Much of the debate about who should pay the cost of community college education revolves around the use of student financial aid. This is a public subsidy paid just to those low income students who otherwise couldn't afford the cost of attendance. It is argued that this aid, together with a larger portion of the cost to be paid by middle and upper income students, is a better way to achieve the equity criterion than to subsidize costs for all students. This approach appears to work if those potential students who are unable to pay are identified and receive aid. But this approach largely ignores the reasons for public subsidy that fall under the efficiency criteria. Thus, there is a role for both the general subsidy for all students and the specific financial aid subsidy for low income students.

Another perspective on the development of fee and financial aid policies deals with identifying those who benefit from the provision of specific services. This perspective concerns the degree to which specific programs and services are thought to benefit the using student, all students, or the taxpaying public generally. The 1960 Master Plan designation of "ancillary" services pertained to those services which were of primary or sole benefit to students using the service. Included were such services as parking, food, and housing. Fees for such services are typically charged to the using student. Certain other services such as child care and development and field trip insurance also may be viewed as being primarily of benefit to the user.

Providing a contrast are those fees, termed by the Master Plan as "program-related,' for services that generally benefit all students. The health fee is sometimes cited as being user-oriented -- not all students use the health service. However, it is to the benefit of the non-using students that other students are healthy. Therefore, it can be argued, all students benefit and ought to pay.

The benefits that accrue to the non-student public were discussed above. Notably, arguments about benefits received are based on the efficiency criterion, while arguments about ability to pay are based on the equity criterion.

Policy Principles

Prior policies of the Board, the Legislature and other executive agencies, together with the theoretical discussion of policy criteria, suggest several principles on which the Board may base specific policy recommendations for community college fees and financial aid.

Community college fees should be low, reflecting an overall policy that the state bears the primary responsibility for the cost of community college education.

This principle is based in part on the efficiency criterion and the idea that the non-student public benefits substantially from the results of community college education and, therefore, should bear the primary responsibility for the cost of that education.

At present, community college student fees support about 4% of the cost of instruction, student services and other supporting services. If the other direct and necessary costs of enrollment -- books and supplies, transportation and child care -- are included, the student's share is approximately one-fifth of the total cost. The student's share is even larger if the calculation includes costs represented by the opportunities for work and other pursuits that are lost to students because of the time needed for commuting, class attendance, and studying. Some argue that the value of foregone opportunities brings the student's share to greater than half the cost. However, since four of five community college students work full- or part-time, it appears they forego other pursuits that can't be measured in monetary terms.

This principle can also be viewed in terms of the equity criterion, specifically the enrollment by community colleges of low income students who would not be able to pay for a larger share of their education. Data indicate that California community college students are less wealthy than those adults in the state's general population who are in similar circumstances. At present, a more wealthy California taxpaying public subsidizes a part of the cost of educating a less wealthy community college student. A typical criticism of public tax support for postsecondary education is that lower income taxpayers subsidize students from higher income backgrounds. Thus, the redistributional consequences of postsecondary education are "regressive" and, therefore, do not achieve the equity criterion. This may be true for many four-year institutions and for community colleges in some other states, but it is not true in the case of California community colleges.

There are no normative measures to indicate what the appropriate shares to be paid by the public and by the student ought to be. The California community college student share of 4% compares with that of about 10% for the CSU student and about 40% for the UC student. But community colleges enroll a much greater proportion of low-income students than do either of the other two segments. From another perspective, California community college students pay about one-fifth of the direct

costs of their education, while community college students elsewhere in the nation pay for an estimated one-fourth to one-third of their education. Even with California's recent fee increase, students elsewhere pay nearly twice what the average California student pays for community college education. However, California also appears to afford its citizens with a much greater degree of access to its community colleges than does any other state.

Community college fees should be predictable, change in a modest fashion in relation to the cost of education, and their burden should be equitably distributed among students.

Marked fluctuations in student fees and other student costs make it difficult for students and their families to plan for enrollment. Consequently, college-going decisions are not nearly as effective as they would be if future costs were more certain. Similar uncertainty about future fee charges and revenue and the consequent future enrollment makes fiscal and academic planning difficult for the college and may not tie to financial aid policies in either the desired or expected way. These problems can be solved by a fee that is predictable and changes in a gradual and modest fashion. Relating the fee to the cost of education insures that the students' and public's responsibilities for support of education remains relatively stable.

Another consideration has to do with fee administration. If other policy criteria are met, simple, easily collected fees should be preferred. Very specific kinds of user fees may not substantially improve either the efficiency or equity of student charges overall.

Efficiency of fee administration must be balanced against the final consideration in this principle, that of equitable distribution of the fee burden among students. This principle involves two concepts. First, students in similar circumstances and receiving similar services, but in two different districts, generally ought to be paying similar fees or a similar portion of the service costs. The practical application of this concept may determine whether a fee is to be mandatory or permissive. Second, the benefits-received criterion suggests that some services be charged at full cost to using students, other services charged at full or partial cost to all students and that still other services, notably instruction, be subsidized by the taxpaying public.

Financial aid should be sufficient to offset fees that may pose a barrier to the access of low income students.

All studies and prior policies have stressed the importance, from an equity standpoint, of financial aid for those students who couldn't afford fees or fee increases. Because California community colleges traditionally have been low cost to students, there has not been great emphasis on financial aid and its delivery. This

problem became evident when the impact of the 1984 mandatory enrollment fee was not offset to any substantial degree by the Board of Governors' new financial assistance program (BFAP). This was due in part to inadequate financial aid office staffing in local colleges.

Financial aid for community college students will become increasingly important, not only because of possible increases in fees and other costs, but also because future community college students will more often be from ethnic groups that report incomes which are among the lowest of all students attending community colleges and, therefore, are among those least able to meet their share of the costs of education.

Fee and financial aid policies should be consistent with fiscal and academic policies in supporting the dual objectives of access and excellence.

Fees and financial aid policies must work consistently with proposed policies that would increase academic standards and provide matriculation services (such as assessment, advisement and followup) in order that access not be restrained nor excellence compromised. For instance, efforts at increasing student retention and performance shouldn't be accompanied by fee and financial aid policies that discourage students from taking the maximum academic load appropriate to their educational objectives and ability.

Financial aid policies should accurately address the needs of those low income students whose course load and general academic progress may be limited because they must work to meet their expenses. And even the most effective financial aid policies will be of little use if course scheduling tends to conflict with the normal working hours of many students.

Policy Options

Current fee and financial aid policies expire on January 1, 1988. Of major concern is what policies should be put in place after that date. Given the need for advanced announcement of fee and financial aid changes, consideration of a new policy must take place during the spring 1987.

The discussion below covers some of the basic policy options that are available for consideration. These options aren't necessarily mutually exclusive; that is, more than one of them could be adopted to make up a consistent package of fee and financial aid policies. In each case, policy alternatives are assessed in terms of the principles described above.

(1) *Change Termination Date of Current Policy*

Termination of the fee and financial aid policy in the middle of the 1987-88 fiscal and academic years makes it difficult for both institutions and students to plan. A mid-year change in fees and financial aid would confuse students and make the job of financial aid officers, for instance, quite difficult. Moreover, it isn't clear why the mid-year termination date was selected by those drafting the enabling legislation (AB 1XX, 1984).

The termination date for current policy could be moved to July 1987 or to July 1988. Moving the date to July 1987 would be difficult since it may not provide sufficient time to announce the change to students and institutional staff. Fees are announced in catalogues that are generally printed early in the spring prior to the fall for which the fees are to be effective. It is doubtful that legislative deliberations would be completed in time for that work. Moving the termination date to July 1988 avoids these problems, but delays implementation of changes that may be viewed by some as urgent.

(2) *Allow the Current Policy to Terminate (Sunset) as Scheduled*

When current policy sunsets, the Board Financial Assistance Program (BFAP) will cease to exist and the mandatory enrollment fee will be replaced by ten permissive fees, including charges for instructional materials, health, and other services.

The major question about this option is whether the fee and financial aid policies that existed prior to AB 1XX are preferable to those currently in place or to some set of alternative policies. Prior to AB 1XX, the Student Aid Commission's Cal Grant Program and the Board's Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, together with participation in the federal Guaranteed Student Loan Program, constituted the only state-supported financial aid for community college students. The fee structure was complex and resulted in students paying quite different rates in different districts. There is evidence that this fee structure was inequitable.

The current fee policy raises nearly $70 million annually in revenue that is applied toward the cost of community college education. This amounts to four percent of current costs and would have to replaced by another funding source if the enrollment fee expires. The offsetting revenue consequences of reverting to the old fee structure are uncertain because of the permissive character of most of these fees. If the same permissive fees were charged by those districts who levied them in 1983-84, with simple cost inflation since that time, the result would be an estimated annual increase of $25 million over the revenue raised by the existing permissives (see Appendix B). The use of these revenues would be restricted just to certain services and materials. Thus, even this

revenue offset would require districts to reallocate the use of their resources and not necessarily in the most efficient manner.

This revenue offset could be greater since not all districts were levying the permissive fees at their maximum rates in 1983-84. If all districts were to levy the maximum in permissive levies during 1988-89, an estimated $45 million would be raised. Again, only a portion of this revenue would offset the general cost of instruction and student services. Moreover, students in different districts would be paying quite different fee rates, future fee changes would be unpredictable, and state financial aid through the BFAP would be eliminated, thereby creating further inequities.

(3) *Continue the Current Policies*

This option can be assessed, in part, by considering the specific answers to questions posed by the Chancellor's study required in AB 1XX. The progress report indicates that while the impact of the fee was perceptible and about as expected in 1984-85 (the first year), this impact did not increase in the second year. And, there is preliminary evidence that college enrollments are increasing in the third year and that the fee may have relatively little continuing added impact. The delivery of financial aid also appears to be improving.

The fee did, however, produce several unexpected and possibly undesirable results. Therefore, it appears that some improvements in present policy are possible. The following options are among those that might enable such improvements to take place by addressing the structure of fee and financial aid policies, how this structure might change over time, and the use(s) to which fee revenues might be put.

(4) *Revise Current Policies*

(A) Restructure the Enrollment Fee

The current enrollment fee structure appears to encourage students to take smaller academic loans than they might otherwise. Those who would take six to eight units, in particular, appear inducted to take fewer units. In addition, the continued use of several permissive fees may be unnecessarily complex. A preferable fee structure would be less complex and would encourage students to take the maximum and most relevant course load possible, given their academic abilities and other obligations.

Another policy consideration deals with the use of fee revenues. Under current policy, revenues from the community college enrollment fee is used as a direct offset to apportionment funds, the majority of which are used to support instructional services.

Some of the policy options include:

(a) Fee Differentials by Academic Load

The argument for fee differentials for academic load is based on less (more) use of educational services by students who enroll for lighter (heaver) academic loads. Charging on a per-unit basis throughout is one possible alternative to the present structure. There are some apparent scale-economies, however. A student taking 15 units doesn't or, perhaps, shouldn't require five times the amount of services that are required by the student taking three units. Accordingly, one possible structure is where greater loads generate greater, but not proportionately greater, fees. The specific structure could be set after a review of the actual use of facilities and services by students taking different academic loads. Besides reflecting scale-economies, this structure also could provide incentives for students to carry larger academic loads than they might otherwise.

It does appear that the structure ought to be continuous and avoid the problem that the current fee produces; i.e., it is possible for a student to add one unit and face a doubled fee.

One alternative is structure where students are charged $5 per unit up to a maximum of $50 per semester. This new structure would produce an estimated $75 million in 1988-89 revenue, $2 million less than the existing structure (see Table 1). A slightly higher fee structure of $5 per unit up to 12 units would go beyond achieving a revenue neutral change, i.e., obtaining the same fee revenues as would have been obtained under the AB 1XX (1984) structure. Similar fee structures, using $6 per unit, would produce at least $12 million more than the AB 1XX rates.

Another alternative to the present structure is simply to change the per unit cut-off from less than six units to less than seven units. Under the AB 1XX enrollment fee, many students take a two-course, six-unit load and pay $50 or nearly $10 per unit. Under the alternative structure, a student taking one course for three units would pay $15, two courses for six units: $30 (rather than $50), and three courses for nine units: $50. Adjusting the cut-off in this fashion provides more continuity and equity than does the present structure. This alternative would produce slightly less revenue than the current structure, even assuming that there would be a modest increase in the number of students taking six units.

Table 1
ALTERNATIVE FEE REVENUE ESTIMATES

	(in millions)	
	1987-88	1988-89
1. AB 1XX	$75.8	$77.3
2. $5/Unit up to $50/Semester	73.3	74.7
3. $5/Unit up to $60/Semester	79.9	81.4
4. $6/Unit up to $60/Semester	87.9	89.6
5. $6/Unit up to $72/Semester	95.8	97.7
6. AB 1XX, but with $5/Unit for <7 Units $50/Semester for 7 or More Units	74.5	76.0

Source: See Appendix C

(b) Fee Differentials by Program or Student Objective

Determining the costs of various kinds of programs and charging students a proportion of those costs is one way of attempting to achieve the efficiency criterion. Aside from the administrative difficulty of accurately determining the costs of programs and the program objectives of specific students, however, it isn't clear that the costs of programs and the public interest in these programs are correlated. For instance, nursing programs are high cost, but very possibly, high public interest as well. Charging nursing students more than, say, students in low-cost programs that have little public interest, therefore, would not appear appropriate.

The policy change of shifting the cost of avocational, recreational, and personal interest courses was implemented under this concept. These courses were deemed to be primarily or solely of private benefit, rather than public or collective benefit. Therefore, the costs are charged entirely to the users or students, similar to the current practice for community service classes and activities. Prior to Proposition 13 (1978), community services were supported by a specific tax levied upon local taxpayers, together with some modest fees. Currently, the user bears the entire cost of community services and since there is no financial aid, those who are unable to pay are generally excluded.

(c) Restructure Existing Permissive Fees

Decisions about permissive fees can be based upon the dual criteria of benefits-received and efficiency of fee administration. On the one hand, services that benefit only their specific users ought to be charged to the users of that service. On the other hand, certain

little-used services may be available to all students and charging specific users may not improve either the equity or efficiency of charges overall. The benefits of charging specific users may not outweigh the costs of fee administration and, in fact, for some minor fees the cost of collecting and processing the fee may exceed the fee revenues collected. Another complicating factor, however, is that the existence of a specific permissive fee does provide an incentive, though no guarantee, for the service to be provided by the local college if it is needed.

One policy option is to eliminate certain permissive fees that are either of minor consequence (such as field trips, field trip insurance and sale of student products) or that no longer have a specific rationale, such as the course drop fee. If such fees are eliminated, however, there must be a way of recapturing the revenues, possibly as part of a larger consolidated fee, so that these or other services aren't eliminated or reduced.

The course drop fee was instituted in fall 1983 and had the effect of reducing course "shopping," the practice where student signs up for many courses knowing they will subsequently drop some. While there is some cost to these transactions, the work is part of the general registration process. Moreover, the enrollment fee, with an appropriate refund policy, would appear to accomplish the purpose of the drop fee. The drop fee, in fact, may serve as an unnecessary disincentive for some students who might otherwise undertake a larger academic load.

Another permissive fee that needs consideration is that for health services. When AB 1XX was enacted, the fee was eliminated but districts were required to maintain their prior level of health service. Consequently, districts were forced to reallocate over $8 million from other uses for this purpose. Either the fee should be reinstituted or the health service requirement should be eliminated. Given the importance of this service, reinstituting the health fee is the preferable approach.

(d) Changing the Use of Fee Revenue

Current community college policy on the use of fee revenues differs with the 1960 Master Plan Survey Team recommendation and with current practices for use of student fee revenue in both the University and State University. After using fees for capital outlay in the 1970s, the University Regents voted in 1976 to use their Educational Fee solely for student financial aid and student services. Since that time, the fee has fluctuated, but its share of

student service costs generally has increased. The State University has employed its fee revenues in a similar fashion (for student services), but with a portion supporting instructional materials as well. Community college enrollment fee revenues are applied each year as a direct offset to the State General Fund apportionment, most of which is used for instructional services.

Current state policy on the use of fee revenues isn't entirely clear. CPEC in 1982, expressed concern about using fee revenues for student services and student aid. There also has been an effort by the Legislature to replace student fees with general funds in support of student financial aid. At the same time, legislative intent in SB 195 (1985) provides that fee revenues not be used to support the costs of instruction.

One policy alternative for community colleges would be to use the enrollment fee revenues to offset just the costs of student services, possibly at a set proportion of those costs or in proportion to the funding of current costs plus improvements, such as in the areas of student assessment, advisement, and follow-up (the "matriculation" proposal). Needed improvements in student financial aid office staffing could be funded from fee revenues.

Net enrolment fee revenues, $64 million during 1984-85, were nearly 40 percent of the costs of student services, $169 million, reported for that same year. Funding of, say, half of the costs of the matriculation program, $25 million, would require an enrollment fee increase of about $23 per student per year. (This would amount to about a five percent increase in the direct costs students face for fees, transportation, books and supplies, and child care.)

Supporting a portion of student services through fees is consistent with existing California practices and acknowledges a part of the community college budget that many feel has been neglected and is in need of improvement This policy has is the disadvantage of creating an expectation that improvements in student services are to be supported by students. There also would be the difficulty of insuring that revenues were used for the intended purpose.

Another possible use of fee revenue is to support student financial aid. This is sometimes criticized as requiring one student to subsidize another. However, dedicating a (possibly fixed) portion of the fee to financial aid ensures that there will be an effort to maintain access if fees increase. Financial aid might need to be further increased, however, if students were to become relatively

less wealthy over time or if other costs such as transportation increased more rapidly than fees.

(B) Restructure the Financial Aid Program

Experience with the BFAP suggests that certain changes might be desirable. Only one-third of available aid was delivered to students during the program's first year. Consequently, the program did not compensate in the expected fashion for the impact that the fee appeared to have on low- and middle-income students. Not all eligible students received aid. And, there is no way of determining how many financially needy students might have enrolled had the aid been more effectively delivered. Problems had to do with awareness of the program, complex application procedures, and inadequate staffing in financial aid offices.

During the program's second year, (1985-86), more students were served and the total aid that was delivered increased by half. This improvement appears to have been due largely to increased awareness on the part of students -- an observed consequence of the maturation of other new aid program -- since aid office staffing was not increased until spring 1986 and since the Board of Governors actions to simplify the program went into effect at mid-year (January 1986) and did not have their full impact until fall 1986 (the third year).

Further changes in financial aid policies could include efforts to:

(a) increase financial aid office staffing,

(b) expand state financial aid provisions, and

(c) increase the number of students who are eligible for financial aid.

While financial aid office staffing was increased from a seven percent allowance authorized beginning spring 1986, staffing is still inadequate to meet the needs of community college students. This allowance adds $10,000 per college (about 0.5 FTE clerical staff), an increase of about five percent in financial aid office staffing. A 1985 study by the Chancellor's Office showed that, based on comparable workload data, community college financial aid offices would need to be increased by one-third across the state in order to achieve the staffing levels authorized in the State University budget formulae.

It appears that the needs of all low-income students, particularly those just over the poverty level of income (outside public assistance) are not being addressed by current policy. There also needs to be consideration of the needs of those students, typically attending part-time, who would

work less (or not at all) and complete their education sooner and more effectively if financial aid were made available.

(C) Establish a Long-Term Set of Policies

Under current policy, a fixed enrollment fee will, over time, become a smaller proportion of the costs of education and students, therefore, may bear a slightly smaller share of the cost. While this may be desirable, it ought to be an explicit, rather than implicit, policy.

Recent experience indicates that a possible scenario for changes to student fees is that of relatively infrequent, but large, increases or even decreases, as in the case of University and State University fees in 1984. This makes it extremely difficult for potential students and their families to plan for college enrollment. It also makes fiscal planning difficult for the colleges and may not tie to changes in student financial aid policies in the desired fashion.

A preferable approach is one in which the long-term sharing of educational costs by students and the public is relatively stable and changes are predictable. This can be accomplished by establishing a framework for sharing and the way in which changes will be made. And, while the future financing of community colleges may be determined by a separate set of policies, fee and financial aid policies should be consistent with those policies.

Possible alternatives include:

(a) Adjusting the Fee to a Fixed Proportion of the Cost of Education.

(b) Adjusting the Fee According to an Accepted Price Index.

(c) Increasing Financial Aid Proportionate with Student Cost Increases.

(d) Increasing Financial Aid toward an Objective of Serving a Certain Proportion of Those in Need.

While these policies appear sound in concept, their practical impact needs to be considered. The average community college student will pay an enrollment fee of $74 in 1986-87. Applying the recent annual community college budget COLAs of six percent to that figure would result in a projected 1987-88 fee increase of $4.44 per student. On a per-semester unit basis, this increase would raise the $5 charge to $5.30.

These figures suggest that, while adjustments ought to be gradual, modest and predictable, they need not be made more than once every several years. If, for example, the current rates were held constant until 1988, a 16 percent adjustment would be required at that time to maintain the student and state share of a cost of community college education that increased by 16% between 1984 and 1987. This change would amount to about $1 per semester unit or just under $15 per year more for the average student. This fee increase would represent an estimated three percent ($15 divided by $500) change in the cost of enrollment (including the increasing costs of books and supplies, transportation and child care along with the fee cost). A cost change of this magnitude would have minimal impact on student enrollment, given the known response by community college students to increases in fees and assuming there will be further improvements in the delivery of financial aid.

The use of BFAP funds increased from $4.9 million in 1984-85 to $7.5 million in 1985-86 and is expected to increase further as aid delivery is improved. Even so, it appears that the $15 million authorization for the BFAP will be adequate for the next several years. Thus, an extension of the sunset date for AB 1XX into the next decade, with the suggested modifications in the fee and financial aid, appears warranted. And, the state's fiscal situation and community college funding mechanism are likely to have changed sufficiently by the next decade that a thorough review of community college fee and financial aid policies likely will be in order at that time.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT FEES CHARGED IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

FEE	PRIOR TO 1984	1984 TO 1987
Nonresident Tuition	X	X
Community Services Classes	X	X
Classes Not Eligible for ADA	X	X
Mandatory Enrollment Fee		X
Eye Protection Devices	X	X
Field Trips	X	
Field Trip (in-state) Insurance	X	
Field Trip (out-of-state) Insurance	X	X
Instructional Materials	X	*
Sale of Student Products	X	X
Materials Fee for Adult Classes	X	
Health	X	
Parking	X	X
Child Development Centers	X	X
Dormitories	X	X
Late Application	X	
Medical Insurance for Athletes	X	X
Use of Nondistrict Facilities	X	
Program Changes -- Adds	X	
Program Changes -- Drops	X	X
Student Records	X	X
Transportation for Adults	X	
Fee for Reduction of Common Fares	X	

* While the instructional materials fee was eliminated, subsequent legislation required the Board of Governors to develop Title 5 regulations allowing students to be charged for materials which they retain after the class.

APPENDIX B

PERMISSIVE FEES

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

This appendix analyzes both the permissive fees eliminated by AB 1XX (1984) as well as those currently in existence. Average charges are applied to enrollment changes to determine, in Tables 1, 2 and 3, what revenues would be generated if the permissive fees eliminated by AB 1XX (1984) were reinstated. Three alternative assumptions are explored. In addition, in Table 4, future revenues from existing student fees are projected based on expected enrollment increases.

POTENTIAL PERMISSIVE FEE REVENUES

Revenues for those permissive fees eliminated by AB 1XX (1984) are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1
ESTIMATE OF PERMISSIVE FEE REVENUE*
1983-84

Health Fee	$ 8,386,369
Field Trips	218,949
Instructional Materials	14,345,133
Late Applications	195,850
Use of Non-District Facilities	14,564
Program Adds	850,893
Materials Fees for Adult Classes	832,146
Transportation	14,381
TOTAL	$ 26,560,073

* This table is based on a survey conducted by the Association of California Community College Administrators in 1984. Data were reported for 62 districts on the permissive fees eliminated by AB 1XX (1984). In order to arrive at an estimated total revenue in each fee category, the fee revenue reported by the 62 districts for the category was divided by the percentage of total statewide enrollment represented by the 62 districts.

The potential permissive fee revenues which would be collected by districts if AB 1XX are to sunset were calculated under three assumptions:

Assumption 1 -- Districts which had previously charged the fees would resume fee charges at the same level (plus cost-of-living changes if the rate was not limited).

Assumption 2 -- Districts which had previously charged the fees would resume fee charges at the maximum rate legally permitted. The total actual amount collected for a given category was divided by the enrollment of the colleges which collected the fee to derive the average fee collected. This average fee was then compared to the legal maximum. The estimate for Assumption 2 was then derived by multiplying the maximum fee rate by the number of students.

Assumption 3 -- All districts would charge the fees at the highest legal levels. COLAs were applied to the fees which are tied to actual cost, and then calculated for the enrollments of all colleges. In the case of materials fees for adult classes, only those colleges which offer noncredit courses were utilized.

Table 2
ESTIMATED FEE REVENUE, 1988-1989

FEE CATEGORY	ASSUMPTIONS		
	1	2	3
Health Fee	$ 8,343,719	$ 12,379,395	$ 18,511,260
Field Trips*	218,793	277,867	1,224,038
Instructional Materials*	14,408,888	18,299,288	21,528,573
Late Applications	195,737	195,737	782,948
Use of Non-District Facilities	14,628	18,577	18,577
Program Adds	769,207	765,360	1,014,785
Materials Fees for Adult Classes*	1,056,215	1,056,215	2,218,050
Transportation	13,000	16,510	16,510
TOTAL	$ 25,020,187	$ 33,008,949	$ 45,298,231

* For estimating these fees, the following cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) factors were employed to set the rate, since they are based on actual cost and have no statutory limit:

1984-85 - 6.10%
1985-86 - 6.19%
1986-87 - 5.77%
1988-88 - 3.22% (proposed)

These are the COLAs established for community college apportionments.

Table 3
ESTIMATED PERMISSIVE FEE REVENUE
SPRING 1988

FEE CATEGORY	ASSUMPTIONS		
	1	2	3
Health Fee	$ 4,167,765	$ 6,195,763	$ 9,264,700
Field Trips*	109,503	139,069	612,619
Instructional Materials*	7,211,504	9,158,610	10,774,835
Late Applications	97,964	97,964	391,858
Use of Non-District Facilities	7,321	9,298	9,298
Program Adds	384,980	383,055	507,889
Materials Fees for Adult Classes*	528,625	528,625	1,110,112
Transportation	6,506	8,263	8,263
TOTAL	$ 12,522,353	$ 16,520,649	$ 22,672,312

* See Table 2.

Table 4
EXISTING COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT FEES

CATEGORY	ACTUAL		PROJECTED		
	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
Enrollment Fee*	$ 68,305,050	$ 73,282,549	$ 74,442,596	$ 75,844,490	$ 77,285,535
Credit ADA	634,879	646,942	659,233	671,758	684,521

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Unit, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.

GENERAL FUND REVENUE

FEE	ACTUAL 1984-85	BUDGETED 1985-86	PROJECTED		
			1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
Child Development	$ 1,345,325	$ 1,294,014	$ 1,412,136	$ 1,436,142	$ 1,463,429
Community Service	13,113,835	14,049,857	14,232,505	14,474,457	14,749,472
Course Deletion	6,229,262	5,693,031	5,767,040	5,865,080	5,976,517
Dormitory	73,067	80,000	81,040	82,417	83,983
Enrollment (After Offset)	64,439,659	65,134,290	65,981,035	67,102,713	68,377,665
Field Trips	21,400	6,300	6,382	6,490	6,614
Instrutional Materials	398,128	637,000	645,926	656,907	669,388
Insurance	124,377	205,000	207,665	211,195	215,208
Student Records	909,844	2,155,045	2,183,060	2,220,173	2,262,356
Non-Resident Tuition	32,828,291	30,351,928	30,746,503	31,269,193	31,863,308
Parking	12,642,871	13,636,458	13,813,731	14,048,565	14,315,488
Other Student Fees	4,768,424	4,507,631	4,566,230	4,643,856	4,732,098
TOTAL	$ 136,894,483	$ 137,850,559	$ 139,642,616	$ 142,016,541	$ 144,714,855

Revenue projections are based upon enrollment projections published by Department of Finance, 1984. Enrollments are projected to increase 1.3% in 1986, 1.7% in 1987 and 1.9% in 1988. It was assumed that revenues collected would be a direct reflection of enrollment changes, e.g. a 1% increase in enrollment would lead to a 1% increase in revenues collected.

* Enrollment fee is amount collected prior to offset by BOG awards.

APPENDIX C

REVENUE ESTIMATES FOR ALTERNATIVE ENROLLMENT FEE STRUCTURES CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES 1987-88, 1988-89

This appendix shows computations of estimated revenues for a series of alternative enrollment fee structures for the Fiscal Years 1987-88 and 1988-89. The assumptions are:

1. AB 1XX, the present law, continues in effect.

2. AB 1XX is modified to levy a $5 per unit fee for less than 7 units (presently less than 6 units), with a continuation of the $50 per semester maximum fee for students taking 7 or more units.

3. A $5 per unit fee for the first

   a. 10 units, up to $50 per semester.

   b. 12 units, up to $60 per semester.

4. A $6 per unit fee for the first

   a. 10 units, up to $60 per semester.

   b. 12 units, up to $72 per semester.

Other assumptions were made regarding student credit workload for different fee proposals. In (1) above, it was assumed that students would continue to take fewer units to avoid the increased cost per unit at the 6 unit level. The actual fall 1985 student hour distribution was assumed to remain in effect.

In (2), (3) and (4) above, the fee level is more gradual with sharp per-unit increases eliminated. Under these assumptions, the pre-fee fall 1983 student (hour) workload distribution was used to reflect a shift away from the distribution brought about by AB 1XX.

For both (2) and (3a), if there were no change in the current workload distribution, fee revenues would be slightly less.

Table 1 provides a summary of revenue estimates based on these alternative assumptions.

Table 1
ESTIMATED REVENUES FROM
ALTERNATIVE ENROLLMENT FEE STRUCTURES
1987-88 AND 1988-89

		ESTIMATED REVENUE (in $ Millions)	
		1987-88	1988-89
(1)	AB 1XX	$75.8	$77.3
(2)	AB 1XX, but with $5/unit for less than 7 units $50/semester for 7 or more units	74.5 (73.6)[a]	76.0
(3a)	$5/unit up to $50/semester	73.3 (71.1)[a]	74.7
(3b)	$5 unit up to $60/semester	79.9	81.4
(4a)	$6/unit up to $60/semester	87.9	89.6
(4b)	$6/unit up to $72/semester	95.8	97.7

[a] Uses alternative student workload assumption, i.e., no change in the current distribution.

Estimated fee revenue is based on the average fee charged for a unit workload and the number of students at that workload level. (See Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5.)

Table 2 presents an estimate of fee revenue for continuation of AB 1XX. In 1987-88, present law would generate about $75.8 million, which would increase to $77.3 million in 1988-89. The $1.5 million increase is primarily attributable to a 20,000 enrollment increase in the second year.

Table 3 indicates that a $1 million decrease in fee revenue occurs if AB 1XX is modified to allow a $5 per unit charge for fewer than 7 units. This assumes that the current distribution of student (hour) workload shifts back to its pre-AB 1XX condition; i.e., students carry heavier loads. If they do not, a further decrease in revenues amounting to another $1 million occurs. Extending the limit to fewer than 7 units reduces revenues because there is a $15 per student saving for about 60,000 students taking a 6 unit workload.

Tables 4 and 5 show revenue computations for a fee structure set at $5 and $6 per unit, up to maximums of $50 and $72 charge per semester. Additional revenues amounting to about $5 million would be realized for a fee structure set at $5 per unit for the first 12 units, with a $60 per semester maximum charge for 13 or more units. These estimates also assume an increase in student workload. If it stayed the same, revenues would be about $2 million less.

In all cases, a $6 per unit fee level tends to generate more revenue than the other alternatives. About $20 million additional revenues would be generated if a $6 per unit charge was levied up to a maximum of $72 per semester.

Table 2
ENROLLMENT FEE REVENUE
AB 1XX CONTINUES
($ Millions)

Units Attempted	1987-88				1988-89			
	Student Distribution[a]		Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Student Distribution[a]		Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M
	%	No.			%	No.		
> 3.0	13.7	141,749	$ 15	$ 2.1	13.7	144,442	$ 15	$ 2.2
3.0 - 5.9	33.0	341,438	45	15.4	33.0	347,926	45	15.7
6.0 - 8.9	15.6	161,407	100	16.1	15.6	164,474	100	16.4
9.0 - 11.9	11.7	121,055	100	12.1	11.7	123,355	100	12.3
12.0 - 14.9	16.3	168,649	100	16.9	16.3	171,854	100	17.2
15.0>	9.7	100,364	100	10.0	9.7	102,269		10.2
	100.0	1,034,662		72.6	100.0	1,054,320		74.0
Other Sessions				3.2				3.2
TOTAL				75.8				77.3

[a] Assumes post-fee student workload patterns (i.e., fall 1985)

Table 3
ESTIMATED ENROLLMENT FEE REVENUES
(in $ Millions)

Units Attempted	Student Distribution[a]			$ 5 Per Unit for Less than 7 Units $ 50 Per Semester for 7 or More Units			
				1987-88		1988-89	
	Percent	Enrollment		Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M
		1987-88	1988-89				
> 3.0	13.0	134,506	137,062	$ 15	$ 2.0	$ 15	$ 2.1
3.0 - 5.9	32.0	331,092	337,382	45	14.9	45	15.2
6.0 - 8.9	17.3	59,666[b] 119,331	60,738 121,659	65 100	3.9 11.9	100 100	3.9 12.2
9.0 - 11.9	11.7	121,055	123,355	100	12.1	100	12.3
12.0 - 14.9	16.3	168,650	171,854	100	16.9	100	17.2
15.0>	9.7	100,362	102,270		10.0		10.2
	100.0	1,034,662	1,054,320		71.7		73.1
Other Sessions					2.8		2.9
TOTAL					74.5		76.0

[a] Assumes post-fee student workload patterns (i.e., fall 1985)
[b] Assumes that one-third of students in interval take 7 or fewer units.

Table 4
ESTIMATED ENROLLMENT FEE REVENUES
1987-88
(in $ Millions)

Units Attempted	Student Distribution[a]		$5 Per Unit				$6 Per Unit			
			Up to 10 Units		Up to 12 Units		Up to 10 Units		Up to 12 Units	
	Percent	Number	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M
> 3.0	11.8	122,090	$ 15	$ 1.8	$ 15	$ 1.8	$ 18	$ 2.2	$ 18	$ 2.2
3.0 - 5.9	31.2	322,815	45	14.5	45	14.5	54	17.4	54	17.4
6.0 - 8.9	18.0	186,239	75	14.0	75	14.0	90	16.8	90	16.8
9.0 - 11.9	12.3	42,421[b] 84,842	95 100	4.0 8.5	105	13.4	114[b] 120	4.8 10.2	126	16.0
12.0 - 14.9	16.6	171,154	100	17.2	120	20.6	120	20.6	144	24.7
15.0>	10.1	104,501	100	10.5	120	12.5	120	12.5	144	15.0
	100.0	1,034,662		70.5		76.8		84.5		92.1
Other Sessions				2.8		3.1		3.4		3.7
TOTAL				73.3		79.9		87.9		95.8

a Assumes student attempted workload will be the same as the pre-fee period (i.e., Fall 1983).
b Assumes one-third of students in interval will take 10 or fewer units.

Table 5
ESTIMATED ENROLLMENT FEE REVENUES
1988-89
(in $ Millions)

Units Attempted	Student Distribution[a]		$5 Per Unit				$6 Per Unit			
			Up to 10 Units		Up to 12 Units		Up to 10 Units		Up to 12 Units	
	Percent	Number	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M	Average Semester Fee	Revenue $M
> 3.0	11.8	124,410	$ 15	$ 1.9	$ 15	$ 1.9	$ 18	$ 2.2	$ 18	$ 2.2
3.0 - 5.9	31.2	328,948	45	14.8	45	14.8	54	17.8	54	17.8
6.0 - 8.9	18.0	189,778	75	14.2	75	14.2	90	17.1	90	17.1
9.0 - 11.9	12.3	42,700[b] 86,981	95 100	4.0 8.8	105	13.6	114[b] 120	4.8 10.6	126	16.3
12.0 - 14.9	16.6	175,017	100	17.5	120	21.0	120	21.0	144	25.2
15.0 >	10.1	106,486	100	10.6	120	12.8	120	12.8	144	15.3
	100.0	1,054,320		71.8		78.3		86.2		94.0
Other Sessions				2.9		3.1		3.4		3.8
TOTAL				74.7		81.4		89.6		97.8

a Assumes student attempted workload will be the same as the pre-fee period (i.e., Fall 1983).
b Assumes one-third of students in interval will take 10 or fewer units.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
DEC 12 1986